

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,351	12/16/2003	Ivan Sepetka	005-004-C1	9651
32746	7590 05/10/2006		EXAMINER	
HOEKENDIJK & LYNCH, LLP			TRUONG, KEVIN THAO	
P.O. BOX 4' BURLINGA	787 ME, CA 94011-4787		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		3734	
			DATE MAILED: 05/10/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/738,351	SEPETKA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit	_			
		Kevin T. Truong	3734				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the mail of the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three mo	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNI t 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status			·				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) 39-50 is/are pending in the applica	ation.	•				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	Claim(s) <u>39-50</u> is/are rejected.						
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers		•				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	• • •	•				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document of th	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage				
Attachmen 1) Notic 2) Notic 3) Infor		4) Interview Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: figures 10-55 are not being mentioned in the description. Since this application is a continuation of 09/605,143, now U.S. patent 6,730,104, which only had figures 1-9 in the drawings. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filling date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

Art Unit: 3734

1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claims 39-50 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 9-13, 17, 18, 23, and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,650. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.
- 4. Claims 39-44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,545. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351 Page 4

Art Unit: 3734

5. Claims 39-44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,104. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Engelson (U.S. 5,749,894).

Note in figures 1-11, wherein the Engelson disclosed the claimed invention.

8. Claims 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mirigian et al. (U.S. 5,700,258).

Note in figures 1-12, wherein the Mirigian et al disclosed the claimed invention.

9. Claims 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kent et al (U.S. 5,853,418).

Note in figures 4-11, wherein the Kent et al. disclosed the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351 Page 5

Art Unit: 3734

10. Claims 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chee et al. (U.S. 5,304,194).

Note in figures 1-8, wherein the Engelson disclosed the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin T. Truong

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3734

ktt